UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/687,991 10/13/2000		Jai Rawat	OBON0003	1050	
GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025			EXAMINER		
			SALAD, ABDU	SALAD, ABDULLAHI ELMI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2157		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS		02/02/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/687,	991	RAWAT ET AL.	RAWAT ET AL.		
		Examin	er	Art Unit			
			. Abdullahi	2157			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears on t	he cover sheet v	vith the correspondence a	ddress		
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MANSIONS OF THE MANSIO	AILING DATE OF T f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no on nication. utory period will apply and rill, by statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUN event, however, may a will expire SIX (6) MC pplication to become A	ICATION. The reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this of the capacity of th			
Status				•			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed	l on <i>04 January 20</i>	007.				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
·	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-3,5,8-10,13-16,19-22,24-2</u>	6 and 28-30 is/are	pending in the	application.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-3,5,8-10,13-16,19-22,24-2</u>	<u>6 and 28-30</u> is/are	rejected.				
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			•			
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ion and/or election	requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.		•			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a)⊡ accepted or l	o) objected to	by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any object	ion to the drawing(s	be held in abeya	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachmen					•		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)			5) Notice of Informal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/4/2007</u> . 6) Other:							

Application/Control Number: 09/687,991 Page 2

Art Unit: 2157

Response

- 1. The response filed on 7/24/2006 has been received and made of record.

 Applicant's argument alleging the final office action dated 10/4/2006 was premature is acknowledged by the examiner and finality office action dated 10/4/2006 is withdrawn.
- 2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 13-16, 19-22, 24-26 and 28-30 have been fully considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 5. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 13-16, 19-21, 24-26 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta U.S. Patent No. 5,963,949 [hereinafter Gupta] in view of Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,199,079 [hereinafter Gupta et al].

Art Unit: 2157

As per claims 1, 13 and 24 Gupta discloses a system for automating data transactions between computers servers, comprising:

a first computer server (see fig. 1c, 140) maintaining a database having stored data recorded therein, said stored data comprising—user specific information concerning at least one user (users meta data), wherein the user specific information comprises at least one username and password (180) associated with plurality of accounts of at least one user a user (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28); program code (applet) residing on said first computer server for creating extracted data by selectively extracting said stored data responsive to a request (see col. 8, lines 15 54); and

additional program code residing on said first computer server for obtaining a blank form, and for parsing said blank form to identify which of said extracted data should be used to fill in at least a part of said blank form (see col. 8, lines 15-54); form filing program residing on the on the first server for creating a filled form in said blank form using an automated fill procedure (see col. 1, lines 17-39). submitting the automatically filled to a second server (sending the filled to a selective proxy) (see col. 8, lines 55-67)

Gupta is silent regarding: concerning at least one user (users meta data), wherein the user specific information comprises at least one username and password associated with plurality of accounts of at least one user a user.

Gupta et al., discloses a system for managing user specific information for internet connected devices, concerning at least one user (users meta data), wherein the user

Art Unit: 2157

specific information comprises at least one username and password associated with plurality of accounts of at least one user a user (see fig. 1, element 170 and 180 and figs. 3A-3D and col. 7, lines 65 to col. 8, lines 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the universal user specific information management for internet connected devices, wherein the user specific information comprises a username and passwords associated with a plurality of accounts as taught by Gupta et al., so that the user can connect different sites without having to remember specific userids and passwords for each of the sites.

In considering claim 2, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said extracted data includes data for all fields in said blank form (col. 8, lines 15-54).

In considering claim 3, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said blank form is obtained from a second computer server (form originating server) (see fig. 1c and col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 14).

In considering claim 5, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said blank form is a login form (col. 3, lines 44-55).

In considering claim 8, Gupta discloses a system, further comprising: an additional database maintained at said first computer server (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);

Art Unit: 2157

additional database having stored form data recorded therein (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);

stored form data relating to forms required by at least one other computer server (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28).

In considering claim 9, Gupta discloses comparing data fields in said blank form with said stored form data recorded in said additional database (col. 8, lines 15-54).

In considering claim 10, Gupta discloses a system wherein said stored form data includes parsed form data from said at least one other computer server (col. 8, lines 15-54).

In considering claim 15, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said blank form is obtained from a second computer server (form originating server) see fig. 1c and col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 14).

In considering claim 16, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said blank form is a login form (col. 3, lines 44-55).

In considering claim 19, Gupta discloses a system, further comprising: an additional database maintained at said first computer server (see col. 1, lines 18-59 and col. 3, lines 20-65); additional database having stored form data recorded therein (see col. 1, lines 18-59 and col. 3, lines 20-65);

Art Unit: 2157

stored form data relating to forms required by at least one other computer server (see col. 1, lines 18-59 and col. 3, lines 20-65).

In considering claim 20, Gupta discloses comparing data fields in said blank form with said stored form data recorded in said additional database (see col. 3, lines 20-64).

In considering claim 21, Gupta discloses a system wherein said stored form data includes parsed form data from said at least one other computer server (see col. 1, lines 18-59).

In considering claim 25, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said extracted data includes data for all fields in said blank form (col. 1, lines 18-59).

In considering claim 26, Gupta discloses a system, wherein said blank form is obtained from a second computer server (form originating server) (see fig. 2, element 14).

In considering claims 28 Gupta discloses a system, further comprising: an additional database maintained at said first computer server (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);

additional database having stored form data recorded therein (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);

Art Unit: 2157

stored form data relating to forms required by at least one other computer server (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28).

In considering claim 29, comparing data fields in said blank form with said stored form data recorded in said additional database (see col. 3, lines 20-64).

In considering claim 30, Gupta discloses a system, further comprising:

an additional database maintained at said first computer server (see col. 1, lines 18-59

and col. 3, lines 20-65);

additional database having stored form data recorded therein (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28);

stored form data relating to forms required by at least one other computer server (see fig. 1c and col. 6, lines 11-28).

6. Claims 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta and Gupta et al and further in view of Hitt U.S. Patent No. 6,249,779[hereinafter Hitt]

Gupta and Gupta et al are silent regarding: using fuzzy fill procedure.

Nonetheless, the principles of fuzzy logic or artificial intelligence to complete forms is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to Gupta system as evidenced by Hitt. Hitt discloses an automated document identification and retrieval system for filling an empty form for information extracted from database using fuzzy fill procedure (fuzzy logic or artificial intelligence) (see col. 4, lines 51-36). Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2157

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the fuzzy fill procedure (fuzzy logic procedure) as taught by Hitt into system such that fuzzy logic is used to automatically fill forms to eliminate the necessity of manual entry of data.

CONCLUSION

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Salad E Abdullahi whose telephone number is 571-272-4009. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

Abdullahi Salad 1/30/2007